

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-28 are currently pending in this application, with Claims 1, 4, 10 and 16 being independent. As indicated above, Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 13, 15-19, 21, 23-24, 26 and 28 have been amended. It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has allowed Claims 4-15 and found allowable subject matter in Claims 19-28.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by *Gao* (U.S. Pub. No 2003/0076793 A1) and Claim 2, 3, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gao* in view of *Miller et al.* (US 5,796,735).

With respect to independent Claims 1 and 16, the Examiner states that *Gao* teaches all of the claimed features of Claims 1 and 16. However, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Gao merely shows systems and methods for controlling vocoding functions that are implemented in a media gateway.

More specifically, in *Gao*, when a radio access network (RAN) needs to send signaling messages to a mobile station, it sends a control message to a media gateway specifying both a constraint rate and a frame count that the media gateway uses to temporarily constrain the rate of one or more voice frames. This allows the RAN to insert signaling information into these rate constrained frames using dim-and-burst signaling techniques.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that the method of independent Claim 1 for synchronizing transmission/reception time for delay in transmission/reception of a data frame of a voice signal is patentably distinct from *Gao*, in that the system of *Gao* does not teach

transmitting information of a forward delay/ reverse delay and receiving the information of the forward delay/ reverse delay for performing a control the synchronization in a base station controller and the media gateway, respectively, as is recited in independent Claim 1. That is, it is respectfully submitted that there is no section of *Gao* that makes any teaching of sending forward/reverse delay information.

More specifically, it is respectfully submitted that no section of *Gao* teaches, “transmitting information of a forward delay and reverse data frames of the voice signal, which is received from the mobile station, from the base station controller to the media gateway; transmitting information of a reverse delay from the media gateway to the base station controller when the media gateway receives forward data frames of voice signals from a called party; and receiving the information of the forward delay and the reverse delay and performing a control for the synchronization in the base station controller and the media gateway, respectively”, as recited in independent Claim 1.

Furthermore, in order to further distinguish the Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 13, 15-19, 21, 23-24 from the Examiner’s cited art, as indicated above, these claims have been amended to more clearly recite synchronizing transmission/reception time for delay in transmission/reception of a data frame of a digital voice signal in a mobile communication system.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that *Gao* fails to show each and every feature of independent Claim 1, and therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 16 recites similar features as those discussed above regarding independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 16 is also patentable over *Gao* for at least the same reasons presented above for Claim 1. Accordingly, it is

respectfully requested that the rejection of independent Claim 16 also be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 17 and 18 are each dependent, either directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1 and 16. While not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, it is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are also believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as set forth above for independent Claims 1 and 16.

Again, it is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 4-15 are allowed.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-28 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, PC
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475